UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,873	06/05/2006	Tim Niggemeier	PD030127	3929
	7590 12/04/200 d, Patent Operations		EXAMINER	
THOMSON Lie			GIARDINO JR, MARK A	
P.O. Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08543-5312			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2185	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/581,873	NIGGEMEIER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LAGITITICI	Art Unit	

MARK A. GIARDINO JR 2185						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	_					
THE REPLY FILED 13 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:	9					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS						
 In the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 						
appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 						
For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and						
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a						
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>						
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:						
/Stephen Elmore/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2185						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: With respect to the limitation inserted into Claim 1 ("the at least two"), the examiner notes that this will require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument regarding claim 1 that "Mes does not disclose or suggest anything with regard to arbitrating commands needed to be sent for specific instructions" has been considered but does not address a specific limitation in claim 1.

Applicant's argument that "Mes fails to teach or suggests "commands" as recited in claim 1" has been considered, but the scope of the "commands" has been changed with the newly added limitation of "at least two" and requires further search and/or consideration.

Applicant's argument that Zuravleff does not suggest "that the commands are prioritized on a static basis and further that a dynamic prioritizing scheme is used for the channels, which transmit the commands" has been considered, but Zuravleff is not alleged by the examiner to teach these limitations.

Applicant's argument that "the combination of Mes and Zuravleff's computer executable commands are different from Applicants' claim 1 and are not applicable to the Applicants' claimed invention" has been considered, but the scope of the "commands" has been changed with the newly added limitation of "at least two" and requires further search and/or consideration.

Applicant's argument that the Office Action "simply puts forth a conclusory statement" regarding the combination of Mes and Zuravleff has been considered but is not persuasive. The examiner maintains that the benefit of adding "precharge" and "activate" commands (as in Zuravleff) would benefit the device of Mes since the precharge and activate commands help the RAM accomplish other tasks, and that this motivation satisfies "a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements".

.